	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/691,649	CHISHOLM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bradley Edelman	2153
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>RC</u>	<u>CE</u>
(1) <u>Bradley Edelman</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Joseph Herndon</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>1 December 2004</u>	Time: <u>3pm</u>	
	cant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: see attached proposed	sed amendment.	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: potential 112, 2 nd paragraph rejections		•
Claims discussed: 1, 19, 20		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate	he examiner will provide a writ	ten summary of the substance
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
		•
Bradley Edelmen		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner suggested that Applicant amend claims to overcome potential 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejections regarding lack of antecedent basis and ambiguity in the claim language. Applicant agreed to the amendments entered in the attached Examiner's Amendment.